



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 09/772,621 | 01/30/2001 | Heino Wendelrup | P12867US1 | 3018 |
| 27045 | 7590 | 05/12/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR C11 PLANO, TX 75024 | | | | RAMPURIA, SHARAD K |
| | | ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 2617 | | |

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| 09/772,621 | WENDELRUP, HEINO |
| Examiner | Art Unit |
| Sharad Rampuria | 2617 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
Please see continuation sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.


GEORGE ENG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 04/28/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Seeing that tag along:

In response to applicant's disagreement that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies on (e.g. *the partial transfer of the voice tag library to the DSP depending on the operating mode selected as seen in Figure 5 and as described on page 5, line 36 through page 7 lines 10 of the present application*...(described in first paragraph of page 6 in arguments) and *the different operating modes including a number of voice tags transferred into a DSP memory from a device memory, said voice tags being a subset of the total number of voice tags stored in the device memory*...(described in second paragraph of page 7 in arguments) and *the operating modes are certain operational characteristics of the phone (volume, ringer level, light, etc.) which are different based on the mode selected and the voice tags are the voice recognition data files mapped to different telephone numbers*...(described in third paragraph of page 7 in arguments)) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully disagrees about the cited passage in the given references. However, the determination of anticipation is still based upon the *Barber* reference as follows. Applicant argues that *Barber* doesn't teach "an associated library of stored voice tags for use by the voice detection sub-module when the operating mode is concerned." Rather,

Barber only discloses voice tags (e.g., HOME, OFFICE, MOM), which presumably are all loaded into DSP memory from the device memory, regardless of the operating mode concerned. Examiner still apparently seeing that voice tags for example “HOME” can operate the numerous memory location of the directory which includes modes like muting, volume changes, quick dialing etc. (please see Col.9; 25-47).

With the intention of above discussion, *Barber* can easily read as the claimed limitation. Consequently as one skill in the art would distinguish the *Barber* edify the claimed limitations. Therefore, it is believed and as enlighten above, the rejections should be sustained.